



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

J. M. Steinke

A.P. Shepherd

§

§

§

Examiner: K. Hantis

Serial No.: 07/953,680

§

§

Group Art Unit: 2505

Filed: September 29, 1992

§

§

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS  
FOR DIRECT SPECTROPHOTO-  
METRIC MEASUREMENTS IN  
UNALTERED WHOLE BLOOD

§

§

§

§

Atty. Dkt.: UTSK:142/BAH

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING  
37 C.F.R. § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being  
deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in  
an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner of  
Patents, Washington, D.C. 20531 on the date below:

October 10, 1995

Date

David D. Bahler

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II.	AMENDMENTS . . . . .	1
	A. Amendments To the Specification . . . . .	1
	B. Amendments To the Claims . . . . .	6
III.	RESPONSE . . . . .	9
	A. The Objection to the Specification is Unfounded . .	10
	1. There is no requirement that claim language appear <i>in ipsius verbis</i> in the specification. .	10

B

2.	The original specification provides support for claims 1-36. . . . .	11
3.	The amendments to the specification now provide literal support for claims 1-36. . . .	13
B.	The Rejection of Claims Under § 112, Second Paragraph is Wrong . . . . .	14
C.	The Rejections Based on Prior Art are Unfounded . .	16
1.	The ten declarations strongly support patentability. . . . .	16
2.	Secondary considerations strongly support patentability. . . . .	18
a.	Commercial success, including licensing the invention, supports patentability. .	18
b.	Failure of others in the industry, long felt need, and unexpected results all support patentability. . . . .	21
3.	The rejections based on Anderson et al. are wrong. . . . .	25
a.	Anderson et al. test <u>altered</u> blood of <u>known</u> composition. . . . .	26
b.	Anderson et al. do not measure concentrations of any components of unaltered whole blood. . . . .	27
c.	Anderson et al. do not contemplate scattering correction. . . . .	29

B

4.	The rejections based on Curtis are unfounded. . . . .	36
a.	Curtis is not prior art. . . . .	36
b.	Curtis alters the blood sample by hemolysis. . . . .	38
c.	Curtis does not contemplate a scattering correction for unaltered whole blood . .	39
5.	The rejections based on Brown et al. are wrong. . . . .	41
a.	Brown et al. alters the blood sample by hemolysis. . . . .	41
b.	Brown et al. do not provide scattering correction. . . . .	42
c.	A co-inventor of the Brown et al. invention thinks the Examiner is wrong. .	42
6.	The rejections based on <i>res judicata</i> are unfounded. . . . .	43
a.	<i>Res judicata</i> cannot apply because the issues are different. . . . .	44
b.	Different claims are different issues. .	44
c.	Different specifications are different issues. . . . .	47
d.	The issue was not actually and necessarily litigated. . . . .	48
e.	<i>Res judicata</i> cannot stand alone. . . . .	50
7.	New claims 37-44 are also patentable. . . . .	52

B

a.	Claims 37-44 are supported by the original specification. . . . .	52
b.	Claims 37-44 are patentable in light of the prior art. . . . .	53
IV.	CONCLUSION . . . . .	54

B